



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the direct method now and then serves to enliven our classes and this modicum is within the abilities of any teacher. That the rigid employment of this method would require more years than our students have at their disposal seems beyond dispute.

I hope that the time will never come when teachers may not be encouraged to describe at our meetings and in our magazines the many devices, large or small, that they have found of service. We can all derive both pleasure and profit from hearing, or reading, these papers. Especially young teachers, just at the beginning of their careers, would gain much from this exchange of ideas. It is, therefore, the duty of each and every one of us to make them see that they cannot afford to miss these opportunities.

At this stage in the world's history we do not need to be told that *man power* is the resultant force of *organization*.

M. N. W.

DR FLEXNER'S FALLACIES

We cannot but be glad that others besides those directly interested in classical studies are recognizing and pointing out the fallacies and the utterly unscientific and prejudiced (perhaps unscientific because prejudiced) spirit in which Dr. Flexner has undertaken the organization of his boasted and much heralded "modern school." If the subsequent work of this school proves to be as one-sided and unintelligent as its promoter's announcement and defense of it, we cannot hope that the cause of sound education will be very much advanced thereby. On the contrary, a school founded on baseless assumption and buttressed on prejudice cannot do other than harm to real education, for the first principle of all progress in this field has always been, and must still be, the open mind.

We are sure our readers generally will be much heartened by the following editorial reprinted from the *Springfield Weekly Republican* of February 15. We value this utterance the more because this is one of the most sanely conservative periodicals in the country, is committed to neither side of the controversy, and cannot possibly, therefore, be charged with special pleading.

Suspensions that Dr. Flexner had erred egregiously in the figures presented to show that the teaching of the classics is a failure are confirmed by the researches of W. V. McDuffee of the Central High School of this city, and president of the Massachusetts State Teachers' Association. In a letter to the *New York Times* he not merely annihilates the argument on this head advanced by Dr. Flexner in "A Modern School," but seriously discredits him as an authority on education.

In that essay Dr. Flexner undertook to discredit the teaching of Latin by showing that pupils do badly in college-entrance examinations. He assumes that a large proportion of the better students take these examinations, and declares that 76.6 per cent in Cicero and 75 per cent in Virgil failed to make even a mark of 60 per cent. From these two premises, both false, he draws the conclusion that "these figures show instead of getting orderly training by solving difficulties in Latin, pupils guess, fumble, receive surreptitious assistance, or accept on faith the injunction of teacher or grammar. The only discipline that most students could get from their classical study is a discipline in doing things as they should not be done."

From the crushing rejoinder made by Mr. McDuffee it would appear that to support his case Dr. Flexner should have represented himself as a product of classical training, for he has gone about as far as possible in the way of doing things as they should not be done. Those who are familiar with school and college work should detect at once the initial fallacy of assuming that those who take the entrance examinations represent the schools fairly. Of course, they include good students, but many of the ablest students are exempted. In the case of the large majority of schools, as Mr. McDuffee says, "the only students who have taken the board examinations have been those who have been unable to do work of a grade which would enable them to enter . . . on certificate. In other words, the poorest students instead of the best." The colleges which have not admitted students on certificates are few.

This fallacy in itself would vitiate Dr. Flexner's reasoning, but it also appears that his figures are grossly inaccurate. They refer to the examinations of an old type, given in 1915 for the last time. There were 1,986 who took the examination in Cicero and Virgil. Mr. McDuffee finds: "The showing in Cicero was extremely poor, but it was just 100 per cent better, and that in Virgil 150 per cent better than that named by Dr. Flexner, who also forgot to mention the eight or nine other Greek and Latin examinations which showed results three times better. There were in all 5,775 'regular' papers in Latin. These papers made a showing about $2\frac{1}{2}$ times better than the 128 irregular papers so carefully selected by Dr. Flexner."

That Latin and Greek are taught as well as they might be the ablest teachers of them would be the last to affirm. But, at all events, if examination papers are to be the test, the classics compare by no means unfavorably with other subjects. With much force Mr. McDuffee retorts: "Compare the 75.3 per cent of the candidates in Virgil, who received a rating of 60 per cent or

over, with the 43.2 per cent in English literature, 21 per cent in American history, 23.5 per cent in English history, 44.3 per cent in advanced French, 47.1 per cent in advanced German, 38 per cent in geometry, 26.1 per cent in solid geometry, 42.3 per cent in chemistry, 48.3 per cent in biology, 49.8 per cent in physics, 27.5 per cent in mechanical drawing, etc. If we "fail egregiously to teach Latin," what shall be said about these other subjects? We need not overrate examinations, which are but an imperfect record or measure of results, but since the issue has been raised it is well to have it made clear that they tell in favor of Latin instead of in favor of "the modern school." It is not the only point at which the soundness of Dr. Flexner's theories is open to serious doubt."

NEW ALLIES AGAIN

[The editorial in the March number of the *Journal* under the caption "New Allies" came from the Pacific coast. Almost simultaneously comes a communication from the Atlantic coast, from Professor W. S. Fox, of Princeton University, on the same subject, showing how widespread is the feeling that our pro-classical campaign must be pushed outside our own camp. It is interesting to note in this connection the significant conference called at Princeton for June 2; see the fuller notice under "Current Events."]

Since the delivery of the first effective attack on the classics as a factor in education, the supporters of the classics have uttered and written many strong words of defense. And in these latter days they go even farther; instead of weakening before what many claim to be an inevitable *débâcle*, they steal the enemy's powder, now instituting courses in "Vocational Latin," now visualizing the language into the same class as engineering graphics—in fact, almost making it a tangible object. Be it said to the credit of these loyalists that they attain as much success as is possible with such transparent devices. In the meantime, however, they are not neglectful of the conservative methods of protecting their position, and accordingly fill the columns and pages of the educational journals, classical and general alike, with statistics, explanations, and apologies.

Now all this is well and good; but, we ask, is it not time for us to pause and ask ourselves if by these methods we are really breaking